

Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC)
Meeting Summary
September 12, 2008

Participants		
Cara Clore	Clinton County	clorec@clinton-county.org
Dan Batts	Michigan Waste Industry Association (MWIA)	DJB@landfillmanagement.com
David Worthams	Michigan Municipal League	DWorthams@mml.org
Dennis Kmiecik	Kent County DPW	Dennis.kmiecik@kentcountymi.gov
Don Pyle	Delta Solid Waste Management Authority	Dswma1@hughes.net
Jim Frey	Resource Recycling	frey@recycle.com
John Hawthorne	Great Lakes Recycling	John@GO-GLR.com
Michael Csapo	Resource Recovery and Recycling Authority of Southwest Oakland County (RRRASOC)	RRRASOC@aol.com
Patty O'Donnell	Northwest MI Council of Governments	pattyodonnell@nwm.cog.mi.us
Steve Essling	Waste Management MWIA	sessling@wm.com
Susan Johnson	Butzel Long	johnsons@butzel.com
Terry Guerin	Michigan Waste Industry Association (MWIA)	tguerin@hrtc.net
Tom Horton	Waste Management	thorton@wm.com
Tonia Olson	Granger	tolson@grangernet.com

DEQ Staff		
Becky Beauregard	DEQ-WHMD	beauregardb@michigan.gov
Christina Miller	DEQ-WHMD	millerc1@michigan.gov
George Bruchmann	DEQ-WHMD	bruchmag@michigan.gov
Liane Shekter Smith	DEQ-WHMD	shekterl@michigan.gov
Lucy Doroshko	DEQ-ESSD	doroshkl@michigan.gov
Matt Flechter	DEQ-WHMD	flechtem@michigan.gov
Rhonda Oyer Zimmerman	DEQ-WHMD	oyerr@michigan.gov
Steve Sliver	DEQ-WHMD	slivers@michigan.gov

Other Agencies		
Karen East	LSB	keast@legislature.mi.gov

1. Welcome and introductions.

Overview of agenda

- Handouts:
- Agenda
- September 2008 Solid Waste Update
- SWAC Legislation Tracking Table
- Michigan Waste Utilization Matrix
- Solid Waste Policy Measurement Goal Implementation Definitions
- Recommended Guiding Principles for Measurement of Solid Waste Utilization

George Bruchmann welcomed the participants.

2. Approve draft meeting summary.

The June 6, 2008, meeting summary was approved. The DRAFT heading will be removed from the minutes on the Web site.

3. Solid Waste Fees/budget

George Bruchmann gave an overview of the current budget situation and updated the committee on the solid waste fees. It was noted that assumptions have changed since the last time solid waste fee increases were proposed two years ago. The new goals of the updated Solid Waste Policy and beneficial reuses were not included in the assumptions made in 2006. New funding predictions have been made based on new assumptions.

Christina Miller gave an overview of the assumptions made in projecting the volume of waste that will be assessed the solid waste fee from FY 2010-FY 2013. It is projected that the amount of waste will decrease by 3.73 percent each year. In addition, Canadian waste will continue to decrease by 9 percent until 2010 and then will remain constant.

It was asked how other states in the region such as Wisconsin and Minnesota have dealt with funding solid waste programs while realizing a reduction in waste being landfilled. It was noted that no states are doing the same thing- many rely on increased general fund support or charge a larger surcharge similar to the proposed \$7.50/ton fee. Concern was expressed over a “declining billable unit”. It was noted that the DEQ assumptions factor in a “floor” for the fund balance of 25% or one quarter of the FY’s needs.

It was also noted that more general fund support has been included to currently fund program, but it will not be enough. The committee requested an analysis of the number of employees and programs in place before funding was moved to a fee based approach as opposed to general fund support. It was noted that no staff

have been added, in fact staffing levels have decreased, and the programs level of service have stayed nearly the same- there are no current plans to increase staff or programs.

Concern was expressed with the estimates of waste that will be landfilled in Michigan, as they may be weighted too heavily on a decrease. It was asked how these projections compare with private projections. Waste Industry representatives on the committee agreed that forecasting is difficult and is not projected more than one year in advance.

It was noted that the Department will be holding a stakeholder meeting for all impacted by fee proposals on November 6, 2008. The actual fee proposals will be discussed at this time. This meeting will outline specific staff numbers and programs, as well as outline what is currently being done and what cannot be done due to budget constraints.

It was also noted that during the last round of fee proposals in 2006 some stakeholders had been interested in a fee structure that doesn't depend on projections, but is adjusted each year based on the previous years' volume. The question was asked of the committee if it was more favorable to know the fee ahead of time or to adjust the fee each year. It was noted that adjusting the fee each year may hurt municipalities who need to budget one year at a time.

It was also asked if monofills or captive facilities would also see a fee increase. These facilities require time for permitting, licensing and inspections and should be paying their "fair share."

4. Standing Agenda Items.

- a. Legislative Update: The legislative tracking table was reviewed and discussed. Very little legislative activity has taken place since the last meeting, not much was available for review. The committee was asked if the legislative tracking table and solid waste update were useful, the committee agreed they were useful tools.

- b. Report on Past Actions/Rulemaking

Compost and Inert Rules: A stakeholder meeting will be held in October or November to discuss the proposed compost and inert rules.

5. Information Sharing Discussion:

The question was posed the committee how they would like to receive additional information from staff and/or committee members. Staff have had a few requests to post links on the website and/or to send information to the list such as the "Stop Trashing the Climate Report". Staff encourages committee members to send

information directly to the committee list. It was agreed that the state should not post links to outside information on the SWAC website.

6. Solid Waste Policy Discussion Topic: Utilization/ Subcommittee report

Chair of the Subcommittee, Jim Frey, gave a report on the subcommittee's activities since the last meeting. The Guiding Principles document was reviewed with the entire committee, an overview of the definitions document was also provided.

The subcommittee agreed with the Guiding Principles document as a working document, but decided time needed to be spent on #7 and #8. It was noted that the question of value posed in Guiding Principle #8 is the education/promotion of recycling, market development, planning, and the opportunity to use the data that can be collected to draw in more business opportunities. It was decided that a new subcommittee would be formed to further explore Guiding Principles #8 and #9. The makeup of the new subcommittee was also discussed. It was decided that the subcommittee needed participation from all sectors represented at the SWAC and it should be a somewhat different "membership" from the previous subcommittee. It was also suggested that we reach out to other groups not represented at the SWAC including the Michigan Economic Development Commission (MEDC) or the Small Business Association of Michigan (SBAM).

The SWAC was asked to go around the room to offer ideas/guidance for the next subcommittee and comment on the Guiding Principles document. The following comments were made:

Subcommittee:

- We need broad representation of all sectors of stakeholders
- It should be smaller
- Funding options need to be discussed
- The question of who will benefit from the data collection needs to be answered and those entities need to have buy-in to the process
- Need a timeframe—it is a big issue and will take time but need a limit
- Need to identify the benefit of the data which may reduce the data set
- Look at large foundations in the state that may provide funding if the data collection will provide economic benefit

Guiding Principles Document:

- Some of the definitions need to be revised
- The document needs to be a "working document"
- Methodology should be developed to fill in the data gaps
- An evaluation of the tools to use and the cost associated with them is needed to inform the funding needed

Volunteers for the next subcommittee are:

Tonia Olson, John Hawthorne, Steve Essling, Jim Frey, Cara Clore, Mike Csapo, Stephanie Glysson and various DEQ staff

The first subcommittee meeting will be Friday, October 17th from 9-noon at the DEQ. The subcommittee will report back on progress at the next meeting.

Groups that should be reached out to in order to gain buy-in to data collection process: MEDC, trade associations, commodity markets, MMA, Chamber, MTA/MML/MAC, Municipal Solid Waste departments

7. Next Meeting Items:

- Reports back from subcommittee

Next meeting is scheduled for November 7, 2008.

Assignment Summary for Subcommittee SWAC 09-12-08

1. Members
 - a. SWAC Members:
 - i. Cara Clore
 - ii. Mike Csapo
 - iii. Steve Essling
 - iv. Jim Frey
 - v. Stephanie Glysson w/Dave Retell
 - vi. John Hawthorne
 - vii. Tania Olson
 - viii. Any others from general notice to SWAC (MML, MMA, MTA)
 - b. Staff
 - i. Becky Beauregard
 - ii. Matt Flechter
 - iii. Christina Miller
 - iv. Rhonda Zimmerman
2. Timeframe
 - a. First Meeting is October 17th
 - b. Progress Report by Next SWAC Meeting
3. Task Assignment
 - a. Guiding Principles:
 - i. Continue editing Guiding Principles as a “working document”
 1. Incorporate any comments from SWAC Meeting (e.g. Lucy had specific edits we need to get)
 2. Change “scientific” references to “technical”
 - ii. Continue to take input on Matrix and Definitions
 1. Seek sources of info on Utilization Data
 2. Seek input on “technical calculations” for data gaps
 3. Need each cell to adhere to measure of quality so that there is a clear answer to “what does this data mean” regarding:
 - a. Source
 - b. Date
 - c. Definition
 - d. Etc.
 - b. Further Detail Value/Benefit part of Cost/Benefit Equation
 - i. Education and promote and market the work that we do – state as a whole, individual industry sectors (e.g. of those industries that are hungry for such info
 - ii. Baseline data
 - iii. Economic/Market development regarding what materials are available for utilization. Other states (e.g. Ohio, Indiana,

- Illinois) use data (tonnages available etc.) from recycling/economic development studies to draw in businesses etc.
- iv. Planning – need accurate data to work with
- v. Show progress
- vi. Justify resources
- vii. Promotion of bio-mass, timber, “how much wood/timber is available in the state”
- c. Identify Specific Tools for Measurement w/Costs
 - i. Database and Web Tools
 - ii. Distinguish between initial costs versus operating costs
 - iii. Incorporate Roles – including Partnerships
- d. Further Detail Overall Cost/Benefit Equation
 - i. Priority data sets – focus for costs?
 - ii. Related to purpose and who benefits
- e. How does Benefit/Value inform where funding should come from
 - i. Examples:
 - 1. Economic development benefits?
 - 2. How to fund “acquisition of data” – ways to address small parts of the cost – how to build on what is already going on
 - 3. Grants/Foundations for startup costs – Kresge
 - 4. Public versus private funding options
 - 5. Are there ways to fund the whole program
 - 6. Are there ways to incorporate “under the wing” of another already existing program
 - ii. Minimum Funding related Task
 - 1. Provide a recommendation on how to approach the funding question in context of Guiding Principle #9
 - 2. “What make sense, what is defensible and what has consensus of support”
- f. Process Recommendation on how to secure stakeholder input and begin to build buy-in
 - i. MEDC?
 - ii. Trade Associations
 - iii. Commodity Market Representatives
 - iv. Manufacturing/Industry that Generates Large Quantities
 - v. Chamber/MMA
 - vi. MTA, MML and MEC and MAC
 - vii. Major Urban Areas
 - viii. Detroit Chamber
 - ix. Grand Rapids Solid Waste Department
 - x. Detroit Solid Waste Department
 - xi.** Some way to get at largest communities and their input?